



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,941	02/10/2006	David Jay Duffield	PU030248	4571
24498	7590	09/15/2008		
Joseph J. Laks			EXAMINER	
Thomson Licensing LLC			ALLISON, ANDRAE S	
2 Independence Way, Patent Operations				
PO Box 5312			ART UNIT	
PRINCETON, NJ 08543			PAPER NUMBER	
			2624	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			09/15/2008	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/567,941

Applicant(s)

DUFFIELD ET AL.

Examiner

ANDRAE S. ALLISON

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 February 2006.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 February 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/09/2006
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract is more than 1 paragraph. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the following item(s) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s):

- a. (Claim 27) medium for storing a recorded movie"
- b. (Claim 27 "a first portion" of the medium

- c. (Claim 27 "a marking pattern"
- d. (Claim 28-32) the medium"

No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-7, 11-18, 21, 23 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chaum (US Patent No.: 5,959,717).

As to independent claim 1 Chaum discloses a method for marking a copy of an image sequence (method for copy prevention of motion picture information – see column 1, lines 55-60) comprising the steps of: presenting the image sequence on a screen (see column 4, lines 8-11 - where the motion picture is projected on a screen); and projecting onto the screen at least one identifier distinct from the image sequence such that the identifier is displayed using visible light along with the presented image sequence (note that messages can be also be projected along with the motion picture – column 6, lines 21-34).

As to independent claim 12, this claim differs from claim 1 only in that claim 12 is system whereas, claim 1 is method and the limitation a projector is additively recited. Chaum clearly teaches a system (see Fig 1) comprising: a projector (12 – see Fig 1).

As to claim 2, Chaum teaches the method, wherein said step of presenting the at least one identifier further comprises the steps of: measuring an illumination of at least a portion of the image sequence presentation (see column 4, lines 42-50); and determining a projection brightness for the at least one identifier based upon the measured illumination (see column 4, lines 52-60).

As to claim 3, Chaum teaches the method, further comprising the step of determining a projection location (video display sub-area – see column 4, lines 10) of the at least one identifier based upon the measured illumination.

As to claim 4, note the discussion of claim 2 above.

As to claim 5, note the discussion of claim 3 above.

As to claim 6, Chaum teaches the method, wherein the at least one identifier is presented at periodic intervals (see column 4, lines 65-67).

As to claim 7, Chaum teaches the method, wherein the at least one identifier defines at least one parameter selected from the group consisting of a theater location (copying source location – see column 8, lines 5-14).

As to claim 11, Chaum teaches the method, wherein the image sequence is a movie (moving picture – see column 1, line 48).

Claims 13-18 differ from claims 2-7 only in that claims 2-7 are method claims whereas, claims 13-18 are system claims. Thus, individual claims 13-18 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 2-7 above.

Claim 21 differ from claim 11 only in that claim 11 is a method claim whereas, claim 21 is a system claim. Thus, claim 21 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 11 above.

As to independent claim 27, all the limitation are discuss above except a medium for storing a recorded movie that when accessed by a processor () results in a playing of the recorded movie. Chaum clearly teaches a medium (e.g. a DVD disk – see column 8, lines 43-45) for storing a recorded movie that when accessed by a processor (44, see Fig 4) results in a playing of the recorded movie.

As to claim 28, Chaum teaches the method, wherein the medium is a digital versatile disc (DVD) (see column 8, lines 43-45).

As to claim 29, Chaum teaches the method, wherein the medium is a camcorder tape (DVD-RAM media – see column 6, lines 1-2).

As to claim 30, note the discussion of claim 18 above.

As to independent claim 23, note the discussion of claims 1 and 7 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 8-10, 19-21, 24-26 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaum (US Patent No.: 5,959,717) in view of Zhang et al (US Patent No.: 7,231,062).

As to claim 8, Chaum does not expressly disclose the method, wherein the projected at least one identifier represents marking data comprising a forward error correction code. Zhang discloses an image processing method (column 1, lines 11-15) wherein the projected at least one identifier represents marking data comprising a forward error correction code (see column 6, lines 7-39 – where video data includes exclusive NOR error correcting code). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the teaching of Chaum and Zhang to the embedded information does not have any adverse influence on the image quality and the embedded information is easily applicable to data-compressed images are more surely guaranteed (see column 11, lines 25-31).

As to claim 9, note the discussion of claim 8 above.

As to claim 10, note the discussion above, Zhang teaches the method, wherein

the forward error correction code represents an exclusive NOR operation of at least some of the marking data (see column 6, lines 7-39).

Claims 19-21 differ from claims 8-10 only in that claims 8-10 are method claims whereas, claims 19-21 are system claims. Thus, individual claims 19-21 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 8-10 above.

.. As to claim 31-32 note the discussion of claims 20-21 above.

As to claim 24-26, note the discussion of claims 8-10 above.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made part of the record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Fancher et al (US Patent No.: 6559883), Wroblewski (US Patent No.: 6018374), Kimura et al, (US Patent No.: 6,742,901), Ohnishi (US Patent No.: 7393108), Duffield et al (US Patent No.: 7,420,649), Tehranchi et al (US Patent No.: 6809792) and Sitrick et al(Pub No.: 2004/0062393) all disclose method related to method and apparatus copy prevention.

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANDRAE S. ALLISON whose telephone number is (571)270-1052. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00 am - 5:00 pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jingge Wu can be reached on (571) 272-7429. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andrae Allison

September 12, 2008

/Samir A. Ahmed/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624